

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Claim 1 is amended.

Claims 4-5 and 8 are cancelled.

New claims 9 and 10 are added.

Claims 1-3, 6 and 7 are rejected under U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shirakawa (US 2003/0117501) in view of Moriya (US 2001/0003707).

Regarding claim 1, neither Shirakawa nor Moriya discloses, teaches or renders obvious that an image displayed in the first liquid crystal display part and an image displayed in the second liquid crystal display part are substantially identical. Shirakawa does not disclose the above fact, because Shirakawa does not teach the second liquid crystal display part of the present invention as admitted by the Examiner in the Office Action and thus there is no way to display the same image in both the first and second liquid crystal display parts. The Office Action states that Moriya is an example of digital camera having a display on each opposite side of the housing. However, there is no disclosure in Moriya that an image displayed in the first display section and an image displayed in the second or third display section are substantially identical. Also, Moriya discloses that necessary and minimum data is displayed on the display section 2 while a large quantity of data is displayed on the other display section 6 (Moriya, paragraph [0036]). This disclosure suggests that data displayed on the front display section 2 is different from the data displayed on the back display section 6 and thus teaches away from the present invention which requires that that an image displayed in the first liquid crystal display part and an image displayed in the second liquid crystal display part are substantially identical. Thus, the

combination of Shirakawa and Morita does not meet all of the limitations of the claim 1, since the combined attachment would not have a function of displaying the same image in both the first and second liquid crystal display parts. Therefore, the asserted combination of Shirakawa and Morita does not render claim 1 obvious. Thus, withdrawal of the rejection as it applies to claim 1 is respectfully requested.

Claims 2-3 and 6 are dependent from claim 1 should also be allowable for at least the same reason.

Claim 7 which includes all of the limitations of claim 1 should also be allowable for at least the same reason.

Regarding new claim 9, neither Shirakawa nor Moriya discloses, teaches or renders obvious that an image displayed in the first display area and an image displayed in the third display area are substantially identical, and an image displayed in the second display area and an image displayed in the fourth display area are substantially identical. Shirakawa does not disclose the above fact, because Shirakawa does not teach the third and fourth display areas which are in the second liquid crystal display part. Although Moriya discloses the second and third display sections in Fig. 5, there is no disclosure in Moriya that the first display section has two display areas. Also, there is no disclosure in Moriya that an image displayed in one of the two display areas and an image displayed in the second display section are substantially identical, and an image displayed in the other display area and an image displayed in the third display section are substantially identical.

Regarding new claim 10, neither Shirakawa nor Moriya discloses, teaches or renders obvious that the images caught by the first camera and the images caught by the second camera

are simultaneously displayed in both the first liquid crystal display part and the second liquid crystal display part. Shirakawa does not disclose the above fact, because Shirakawa does not teach the second liquid crystal display part. Moriya does not disclose the above fact, because Moriya does not teach the use of a camera in the device in such a way that the images caught by two different cameras are simultaneously displayed in two different liquid crystal display parts.

In consideration of the foregoing analysis, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and notice to that effect is hereby requested. If it is determined that the application is not in a condition for allowance, the examiner is invited to initiate a telephone interview with the undersigned attorney to expedite prosecution of the present application.

Appl. No. 10/532,399  
Amtd. Dated June 26, 2008  
Reply to Office action of April 18, 2008

If there are any fees resulting from this communication, please charge same to our  
Deposit Account No. 16-0820, our Order No. NGB-38155 .

Respectfully submitted,

PEARNE & GORDON LLP

By: 

Nobuhiko Sukenaga, Reg. No. 39446

1801 East 9th Street  
Suite 1200  
Cleveland, Ohio 44114-3108  
(216) 579-1700

June 26, 2008